

10/1/95
OCT-5 1995

To whom it concerns:

FCC MAIL ROOM

We have essentially removed the television and the programming it purveys from our family life and activities. We do not wish to expose our children to any of the offensive, insulting or dumbing down programming that my husband and I find pervasive on the set. PBS alone offers us programming that we feel is worthy of our time and attention. PBS is the only reason we still have a television in the house!

Here are some points we'd like to be considered regarding television programming:

① not enough educational programs are being aired. Thank God for PBS!

② Some major problems surrounding children's programming are:

① violence as an attention-getter and
Keeper

② programs laced w/ corporate

No. of copies rec'd
List ABCDE

themes, products, m

- ③ materialism is promoted by the programs but especially by the commercials geared toward children ages 2-17.
 - ④ programs promote anti-family, anti-children message
 - ⑤ becoming engaged in most syndicated programming at at kids requires a "dumbing down" to stay with it
- ③ Some solutions:
- ① let PBS model how they do and what they do so well for syndicated stations
 - ② identify programs for: violence, IQ, degree of attention span required, attitudes or views presented that are anti-family, anti-parent or anti-childhood

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,
Noelle Price

teacher, mother of 2

11415 NE 64th Ave
Vancouver, WA.

98686
(360-573-2806)

RECEIVED

MM 93-48

Sept 30, 1995.

OCT - 5 1995

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FCC MAIL ROOM

Federal Communications Commission

Office of Secretary

1919 M. ST. N.W. W.A. D.C. 20554

Dear Sir: —

We certainly Recommend Toughening
the children & Teenage Television Act.
We feel there is a lack of decent fam-
ily programs.

We understand, the fall & winter sched-
ule's have been reprogrammed to
Prime Time.

Is it any wonder with Prime Time
shows, that promote vulgarity,
sex and murder, that Teenage's
behavior is out of control?

Please if it is under your con-
trol to make changes do so. You
will be doing the nation a great
service

Sincerely,
Henry Vander Pol

Henry Vander Pol
1400 River View Ln.
Mt. Vernon VA. 22081

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0

^{MM}
Docket # 93-48

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communication Commission
Office of the Secretary
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED
OCT 5 1995
FCC MAIL ROOM 1

I would like to comment upon the proposed legislation concerning how (or should) broadcasters can best fulfill the Children's Television Act.

Let me start by saying that I truly enjoy television. It can be a very good form of entertainment, information and even education.

I also believe in as little government interference as possible.

That being said, I feel that the crux of the problem is that television CAN be a good form of information, entertainment, and education for children, but it seldom is. Adults seldom use television for education or information (except for an hour of news). But children can benefit much more from good educational programming.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0

Where most children's television (be it network or cable) fail is in educating children. Much of the present so-called children's education on television is a joke.

How do most broadcasters and stations presently "educate" our children? At the end of a 20-minute program (that is usually designed to only sell a toy line in the first place), the show presents a 10 to 30 second blurb about something educational. The blurb often doesn't even have a tie-in to the show just aired.

A twenty minute show designed to sell toys, followed (and preceded) by 5 minutes of commercials, that then has 10 to 30 seconds of education? Is this education? Does it help our wee folk? No way!!! More needs to be done.

Television CAN be a great educational tool. There ARE many good, ENTERTAINING and EDUCATIONAL shows — mostly on PBS (another issue all together): 3-2-1 Contact; Sesame St; Mr Rogers Neighborhood; Ghost Writer; Magic School Bus; Barney (yes the purple Dinosaur is good for children); Bill Nye the Science Guy;

and Reading Rainbow.

These shows are all great fun, entertaining AND great education. None are violent and none are biased towards one group or another. They teach lessons plus kids LOVE the shows. They all prove that television can give us good education at the same time as good shows and wonderful television. They are the best.

Why don't more of these types of shows show up more often on television? Why aren't there more shows of this caliber? The answer is simple — The Almighty Buck!

It is true (and a fact of life) that broadcasters and animation companies do deserve (and need) to earn a good return on their investment. That is the engine that drives our economy. However our children deserve better than getting one message — BUY, BUY, BUY. Is this an evil message — NO. Should it be the all pervasive message — again NO!

Why don't the networks and cable shows do a better job of educating?

It is very expensive to research factual information. It takes time and staff to create and develop a fascinating show that catches and keeps a child's attention AND THEN teaches too. Time is money.

It is much easier and less expensive (and quicker) to throw together a fast-paced slick piece of animation that has no basis in history or reality. It is far easier to create a glorified 20-minute commercial (and less expensive in the long run). It is far easier (and cheaper) to make a show with no educational content.

Should there be a Children's Television Act?

MOST DEFINITELY!!!

Why? For two very important reasons:

1) The networks and cable outlets track record concerning children's programming is at best DISMAY — at worst CRUEL. When left to their own devices the wee folk suffer, because television

programmers simply don't care. Do it quick,
Do it cheap, Do it dirty — but get those
advertisers' their audience. No thought
is given to the next generation.

2) Children are the least prepared of our
society to understand and see through the
advertiser's skills and games. Adults
at least have the ability and skills to
evaluate shows and commercials for
themselves — children cannot.

We should maintain the Children's
Television Act until the broadcasters
prove to us that they can be trusted
with the most vulnerable segment of
our society.

Keep (and even strengthen) the
Children's Television Act.

Jim McLaren

Jim McLaren

19 LENOX ST

SPRINGFIELD MA

01109-1830

MM93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 5 1995

From: <JeneaneL@aol.com>
To: A16.A16(kidstv)
Date: 10/4/95 8:16pm
Subject: Re: Children's Programming and MM Docket 93 - 48

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

MM Docket 93-48 Just wanted to let you know how much it means to us when we see a child with disabilities included in childrens' TV. Our seven year old loves to see other children, like her sister, who have Down syndrome and our five year old is always so excited to see someone like her. It seems to me that disability parity is just as important as racial or gender parity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeneane Lunn
13 Franklin St
Montpelier, VT 05602

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 5 - 1995

From: <ealessi1@ic3.ithaca.edu>
To: A16.A16(kidstv)
Date: 10/4/95 8:40pm
Subject: comments to fcc

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I feel that the regulation of television is needed. According to an American Psychological organization that looked at almost one thousand studies, research has indicated that there is an association between the viewing of violent material and aggressive behavior. (Parents Magazine, January 1993 v68 n1 page 116)

Children watch television and absorb what they see. Then, they aggressively act on their ideas which they receive from influential television programming.

I believe that children's programming should be educational. From the morning till 6:00pm in the evening, television should contain programs that enlighten children and young adults. Children should be exposed to television programs that give them knowledge. They should also be introduced to programs that give them a realistic portrayal of life.

Children must begin to understand that society is not like the widely acclaimed prime time drama Melrose Place or the half hour situation comedy Friends.

For example, Melrose Place gives many children the idea that every "twentysomething" has to be beautiful and promiscuous to achieve a desired goal. Infidelity is also made out to be some kind of trend on Melrose Place and other series which gives young adults the idea that it is alright to engage in such activity.

Many children also are influenced by the television sitcom Friends.

Friends gives an unrealistic account of a young adult's life. People in real life have to go to work, instead of hanging around their apartment all day engaging in frivolous behavior, just like most of the cast members.

More importantly, it is crucial that parents take charge and begin to control what their children are viewing. It is their responsibility to tell their children what is worthwhile to view on television. It is also the parents who should guide their children and make them aware that what television portrays does not reflect real life.

I do believe that the FCC's job is to regulate television, but it is impossible to ban every explicit program and film. Again this where the parent must take CHARGE. It is their decision to enforce what is viewable and what is not. Parents may also want to watch educational television with their children to make it seem more exciting.

Edward Alessi
Ithaca College
953 Danby Road
Ithaca, NY 14850

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("massmedia@liber.ithaca.edu")

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 5 1995

From: Patricia L Dedert <pldedert@erenj.com>
To: A16.A16(kidstv)
Date: 10/5/95 9:07am
Subject: MM Docket 93-48

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

It would be WONDERFUL if we occasionally saw someone you might think of as "a little weird" due to learning disabilities, communication/perceptual handicaps, etc., as incidental characters on TV shows. We are seeing more special features that focus on such characters and their families (e.g., David's Mother) and they are great, but they focus on the problems. To see families and neighbors incidentally, casually interacting with a kid who is "a little slow," not a smart-mouth, wise-cracker could do a lot to raise consciousness. There are many families out there who are are dealing with kids outside of the mainstream, in special education, and it would be great to feel represented in the popular media.

Sincerely,

Patricia L. Dedert

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 5 - 1995

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: <DianeM2@aol.com>
To: A16.A16(kidstv)
Date: 10/4/95 10:10pm
Subject: MM Docket 93-48

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I would like to comment about including people with disabilities in children's television programs.

I have two children with disabilities that are very different, but these two disabilities are more prevalent in the schools today. My 10 year old daughter has autism and mental retardation and my 5 year old son has attention deficit disorder. I am enjoying the programs that include people with disabilities. For my children, this makes them feel as though they aren't very much different than any other child. I feel that this also helps a great many children realize that children with disabilities are very much like they are.

Fewer children with disabilities are being kept at home in this time than in the years past. As a result, people are interacting more and accepting differences more. But for the schools and communities that do not have special needs families, they are not able to understand that each child is the same.

I feel that more programs need to include children with a variety of disabilities.

Diane Pusieski
Wilsonville, Oregon

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

7819 Chelsea Street
Ruxton, Md. 21204
October 3, 1995

FCC MAIL ROOM

OCT 05 1995

RECEIVED

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554
RE: Docket # MM93-48

Dear Sirs/Madams:

I am writing you to encourage you to pass new requirements for commercial television stations to provide at least three hours of educational/instructional programming per week. I would prefer that the stations be required to provide at least 14 hours of such programming per week.

As the parent of four young children, I have been horrified by what is broadcast daily on television, and particularly by what the networks believe are "family programs." I banned my children from watching any network television after viewing, with them, on ABC's Friday evening "TGIF" line-up, which is supposedly a series of four shows designed for kids, a family sitcom in which a college professor gave a boy an "A" on a paper because she thought he "had a cute butt" and intended to "show him what a teacher's pet could be". Then, after my five-year old told me that "boys are better than girls -- that's right, isn't it Mom?" I began to search out reasons for his belief -- I work outside the home, my husband shares chores and responsibilities, etc.-- I centered my attention on the television shows he had been watching on Nickelodeon. I realized that all of the shows had boys as main characters, and any girls were characterized as either dingbats or nasty. My husband and I decided to cancel our cable service.

I don't have a single friend with children who is not extremely upset about the quality of children's programming offered on network and cable television. As a friend put it, the quality of most of these shows are like comic books. When our children turn on the television, their choices are the equivalents of a newspaper, an adult paperback, or a comic book. Shouldn't they be offered other literary choices? I worry about what views of life our kids are getting by what they see on TV. Most of the characters are wealthy, they use crude language, behave in sexually inappropriate ways, and have you noticed that most of the parents are portrayed as stupid or at the very least, innocuous? There is so much to learn and know and explore, and our children don't get much of a chance to do it through television.

Sincerely,



Pat Mochel

No. of Copies rec'd 6
List ABCDE

MM93-48

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

OCT 5 1995

From: <cmcquin1@ic3.ithaca.edu>
To: A16.A16(kidstv)
Date: 10/5/95 3:34pm

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

To: The Federal Communications Commission
Re: ChildrenUs television programming

I am a freshman journalism major at Ithaca College in upstate New York concerned with the media and legislature regarding it. Recently, the professor in my mass media course assigned us the task of finding and reading academic journal articles regarding childrenUs television programming. Through this search, I learned a great deal about the issues and questions surrounding childrenUs television. I also came up with my own opinions on the matter.

There were many instances of government funding for childrenUs television cited in the various articles. Questions were raised as to how much should be spent on childrenUs programming, and if there should be any expenditure at all. The V-chip was brought up numerous times, sometimes implying a future for an S(ex)-chip and a L(anguage)-chip. One thing stood out above all and made the most sense to myself personally: family responsibility.

One article from the Journal of Contemporary Human Services illustrated the logic behind beginning childrenUs programming with family and education in mind. The piece described the importance of parents and guardians, or teachers being able to supervise their children or students in what is being viewed. Government cannot be the ultimate watchdog in media; something can and will slip by the boards. And neither do all parents care to know what the kids are watching these days. What could be tolerant to one family may be completely out of the question to another.

But in order for those parents who do care and teachers to set aside the time to play the role of gatekeeper for their children, it helps to seem like something diversionary. In the 1990s, pure devotion to a childUs future as a healthy, happy human being is simply not enough to motivate parents. Between taking the kids to practice and cooking dinner, the average family will not easily have the time to monitor childrenUs television. When a mother or father can squeeze a glance at the television between chores to sit down with their children, it helps to be something they won't mind.

Thus, it would be a great step to create childrenUs television programming with a family audience in mind. Then the broadcast times of these shows must be made known to parents in such a way that it is obvious. Certainly, programs like RBarneyS may have some educational merit for children, it loses that certain appeal for adults. Perhaps this is one area that could use some developmental research if not funding.

Setting this aside, I really admire the effort that the FCC is taking to gather the public opinion on the issue of childrenUs television programming. It proves a lot to me of the responsibility that is taken by the Commission and put into the people. On the behalf of America, we appreciate the outlet for our own ideas.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE